DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 389 CS 216 622

AUTHOR Kelder, Richard
TITLE Examining the Role of Sociocultural Contexts and Tasks in Teaching Academic Writing: A Review of the Literature.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Research Needs; *Revision (Written Composition); Sociocultural Patterns; Teacher Role; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Discourse Communities; Rhetorical Strategies

ABSTRACT

The aim of this review is to identify and examine the rhetorical features, conventions, and sociocultural contexts that students engage when they enter an academic discourse community. The review seeks to identify and analyze the intertextual relationships between teacher/authority recommendations and the development of student autonomy and voice in revising texts; the interaction and conflicts between students' personal experience and the development of a professional persona and voice in academic discourse; and the interaction between the institutional/disciplinary, cultural, and social contexts and students' personal experience and prior knowledge as they learn to compose academic discourse. It also examines how teacher/student conflict may create a dynamic that alters both the role of the participants and the processes for creating disciplinary knowledge. After a critique of the studies, suggestions are offered about areas to the explored for additional research to identify instructional methods and contexts for teaching writing in and across the disciplines. Contains 13 references. (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 389

Examining the Role of Sociocultural Contexts and Tasks in Teaching Academic Writing: A Review of the Literature

Richard Kelder

The aim of this review is to identify and examine the rhetorical features, conventions, and sociocultural contexts that students engage when they enter an academic discourse community. The review seeks to identify and analyze the intertextual relationships between teacher/authority recommendations and the development of student autonomy and voice in revising texts; the interaction and conflicts between students' personal experience and the development of a professional persona and voice in writing academic discourse; and the interaction between the institutional/disciplinary, cultural and social contexts and students' personal experience and prior knowledge as they learn to compose academic discourse. It will also examine how teacher/student conflict and interaction may create a dynamic that alters both the role of the participants and the processes for creating disciplinary knowledge. After a critique of the studies, suggestions will be offered about areas to be explored for additional research to identify instructional methods and contexts for teaching writing in and across the disciplines.

Studies of teaching writing in disciplinary and other academic contexts at the postsecondary level have revealed considerable but often contradictory evidence. Research in this area has focused on how students learn to write in a disciplinary context and how academic content, ways of knowing, and rhetorical expression are interwoven in discourse. The concept of a discourse community represents for some a unique disciplinary culture with language-specific discourse, a specialized lexicon, a set of literate practices, and rhetorical and interpretive conventions for constructing knowledge. The approach to teaching writing to students in this context is based on disciplinary enculturation, developing methods to make an outsider into an insider in the community. Much of the prior research was implemented because many scholars believed that traditional writing instruction in composition courses failed to prepare students for the complex writing assignments they had to perform in writing in an academic discipline or in producing professional discourse at a more advanced level.

Most of the research has employed ethnographic and naturalistic inquiry approaches; however, there have been studies that employed both quantitative and qualitative methods. Prior research has focused on students' experience and initiation into multiple academic discourses by looking at paradigms based on the relationship between novice and expert, the processes of disciplinary initiation, and ethnographic approaches that examined how students' interpreted their instructional experience in academic culture and writing discourse. In the 1980s research methods often followed the cognitive model theory based on protocol analysis proposed by Flower and Hays, as well as descriptive research, and naturalistic inquiry models borrowed from the field of anthropological research. In one of the first studies of students' writing in an academic discipline Herrington (1985) studied students as they wrote in chemical engineering courses, specifically in a

CS216622

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Kelder
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

lab and a design course. Her study revealed conflicts between teachers and student perceptions about the nature of audience, the purpose of assignments, and the social role of writing in a discipline. Herrington's study moved others to look at how each classroom or course may in fact represent a unique discourse community. She observed that in the lab course students wrote for the professor, the disciplinary authority, even though some professors saw themselves differently, and not as the all-knowing expert, and they expected more explanations and justifications in students' reasoning. In the design course, there was more agreement between students and professors about the nature of writing, roles, and audience, and faculty and students worked together to prepare assignments for an audience conceptualized as professional engineers. Herrington concluded that the way claims, propositions and evidence were presented in writing was different in each class.

McCarthy (1987) in her naturalistic study of a student as he interpreted and wrote assignments in three different courses, poetry, composition, and biology, came to similar conclusions as Herrington. Her study revealed that each class required a different kind of writing and that teachers did not make these rhetorical conventions and modes of writing explicit to the student. For example, in the composition class students were taught thesis-subthesis models and writing skills; however, the poetry class required literary explication, and the biology class summary writing. Thus, McCarthy's student found himself in a difficult predicament as he attempted to interpret assignments and translate what he learned in composition (thesis-subthesis) to each writing assignment in each course. McCarthy and Walvoord's (1991) ethnographic study also used this naturalistic inquiry approach to examine how teachers' classroom roles, language, and assignments influenced students' writing in four disciplines: history, business, human sexuality and biology. Their study indicated that each teacher used different models and language to identify and teach reasoning in their discipline. The study raised many questions about how to teach writing in a discipline and emphasized the importance of the roles that teachers create for themselves and their students in their classroom. It is also suggested, like Herrington's study, that each class may represent a discourse community. In each class, the teachers created their own learning environment and modeled different kinds of reasoning and critical thinking in the class and expected their students to write in specific ways. Each instructor also looked upon the student as the "professional-in-training." For example, writing in the business course was based on the model of student as decision maker, in history the student writer was the classic debater or arguer, and in biology student as scientist. The model dictated how students learned to write. In history the class assignments were issue-oriented and students wrote argumentative essays while in business students dealt with problems that demanded a "define/analyze/prescribe rubric" (p.94). The researchers discovered that students at times did transfer knowledge of one writing model to another context successfully, but they also experienced problems and often applied a model inappropriately in other disciplinary contexts. What is clear from this research is the importance of the role that teachers and students create for understanding and interpreting writing expectations, conventions, and assignments and the importance of classroom contexts, roles, and language use. Some of the questions that these researchers raised in this study will be addressed in this review ? How do students interpret teachers' messages about models? How do students' select appropriate models? (p. 233). What language and models for good/better/best reasoning exist in other classrooms? Are the models discipline specific? What models and language do teachers use to

present the reasoning process ? (p.231) Other questions will relate to the relationship between writing in and out of academic discourse and the social and cultural processes involved in disciplinary enculturation and how these may affect not only the student's performance but the role of the instructor as well. Finally, a primary question remains: Is there one kind of instructional model that provide students with the ability to write effectively in different domain-specific areas? And what kinds of concrete and situated learning activities give students the ability to move into academic writing?

The following studies examine the relationship between writing task, instructional feedback and revision during the composing process and attempt to uncover what occurs during this instructional process. In his case-study of an adult student as she writes in an undergraduate literature course and in her professional role for a childbirth clinic, Doheny-Farina (1989) provides insights about the nature of role in the construction of academic and non-academic discourse by analyzing how her performance in each context affects the student's writing and either contributes to the conservation of or a change in the discourse community. Under the guidance of her literature instructor, Anna comes to understand the disciplinary framework of literature and the discipline-specific processes involved in constructing an original idea or interpretation. Through a series of discussions with her instructor and reflections, Anna learns to integrate her personal experience with the situation facing the main character in Barth's *The End of the Road,* and creates an original idea for a research paper. Doheny-Farina identifies the social factors inherent in the classroom community and the strategies the instructor created and modeled for students to develop original ideas within the framework of an established body of knowledge. Through his institutional role the instructor helped Anna understand the role or persona she had to assume in order to contribute something original to the academic discipline. Thus, Anna has taken on an insiders role in this community. In her role as a publication writer for a childbirth clinic, Anna assumes a different role in her writing to deal with the internal and external factors as well as her own ethical beliefs. At the clinic, Anna has to maintain the community against internal political factions and in-fighting, and against external forces, the clinic's hostile critics. Doheny-Farina suggests that the role one assumes in writing in a discourse community can determine whether one changes or maintains the community. Each professor in McCarthy & Walvoord study also showed students how to use language as a member of their specific community. Doheny-Farina's study is important because it provides a perspective to compare the world of non-academic discourse to academic discourse and the importance of understanding the nature of audience during the composing process in both contexts. In situating the writing process in the diverse environments, the study also suggests that perhaps students need more instruction about how to assume a professional role as they learn to write in academic courses, which is addressed by both Herrington and McCarthy & Walvoord's studies. Doheny-Farina suggests that the kinds of discourses examined in the study can exist in both academic and nonacademic discourse communities and the study sets the stage for exploring how the specialized language of the professions and disciplines both maintains and creates knowledge.

In another study Herrington (1992) follows two undergraduate students as they learn to write in an undergraduate one-semester writing intensive anthropology course. Here, Herrington's concept of community is based on Geertz's notion of "intellectual villages." When students enter this entity they are attempting to learn its "ways of speaking" and "ways of knowing" and to

bridge their personal world-view and the professional world of academic discourse (p. 92). Herrington observes Kate, an able student and confident writer, and Sally, a less confident student and writer, as they write and revise drafts of different kinds of writing from book reviews and descriptive field reports to journal research articles. Each assignment demands shifts in language, voice, and perspective. At the suggestion of her teaching assistant, Sally begins to move from using distant, impersonal language that she thought was more academically appropriate to a more personalized use of language in making her claims. Herrington notices that in her revisions Sally begins to focus less on herself as a learner and more on creating a researcher persona and that she begins to assess what she has learned. In giving up the formulaic and objective language that creates distance, a writing style Sally thought was correct, and by integrating her personal experience with course content and her research subject, Sally has entered the gates of the community. Kate, a more passive student, has difficulty "formulating a research question" and in her revisions, for the most part, edited her drafts by incorporating words and corrections recommended by the teaching assistant. Instead of recommending global revisions as he did in both students' field reports, the teaching assistant made no recommendations for global revision in Kate' s research paper and made explicit changes in Kate's draft which suggested to Herrington that he had "missed chances to help Kate understand conventions of academic discourse in anthropology and decide for herself how she would present herself and what issues she would focus on" (p.108). Herrington concluded that students must learn to "insert" themselves rather than "efface" themselves in discourse and assimilate the village's "ways of thinking and speaking" as their own (p. 111). Herrington's observation of the tendency for some instructors to intervene more in the instructional process with a passive student like Kate by making changes for them in revision is important because she recognizes that it invariably reinforces dependency in the student.

Identifying the instructional methods that enable students to examine the global features of discourse production in academic areas prior to composing final drafts has been addressed often in the literature. However, most of the research in the area has focused on composition instruction. Beason (1993) in his study of twenty randomly chosen college students writing in four writing enriched content (WEC) courses looked at patterns in the feedback and revision process to gauge whether or not students were incorporating instructors' suggestions and recommendations for revision. Beason seeks to identify and examine the aims teachers and peer evaluators had in mind when they made suggestions for revision, (praising, editing, advising, etc.). He also analyzed the kind of criteria that guided the feedback (development & support, organization, mechanics, etc.), and whether or not writers addressed the feedback. He also wanted to identify the criteria most reflected in students' revision, and the level of discourse at which the revision occurred (global, local meaning, surface, etc.) The most significant results in the study were that advising was the most occurring function in each class during instructional feedback, that development and support were the most common criteria identified by both teachers and peers, and that global meaning revisions were sparse, representing only 7.7% of evaluators' comments against 52.1% for surface-level revisions and 40.2% for local meaning revisions. Beason suggests that non-global changes may be more prevalent in student writing because most readers and writers value them. After all, most instruction in composition courses as well as in other writing courses focuses on the surface features of grammar and mechanics so it

should not come as a surprise that these revisions are reproduced in every writing context, even though the rethinking of a concept or idea may be more important. Beason's study suggests that teachers and peers also seem to agree on what constitutes effective written discourse; however, one would suspect that this may not hold once students enter post-graduate or professional study where they need instruction in academic literacy practices and in writing professional discourse. Beason's study raises the issue of how to teach students to recognize rhetorical patterns and conventions in an academic subject and how to use them to reorganize and reconceptualize meaning at the global or macro level where it is most needed. One of the primary factors in the literature that suggests how this can be done effectively is for the instructor to model thinking and create classroom contexts and discussions that explicitly reinforce discipline-specific reasoning and writing.

A more recent study by Patthey-Chavez and Ferris (1997) examined the transcripts of students' writing conferences with their instructors on a first draft to determine how the comments effected the revision of the final draft. Unlike the previous study, this research project sought to evaluate how the dialogue between teacher and student affected how a student wrote the final draft. The researchers view the conference from a theoretical framework based on Vygotsky and see the interaction between student and teacher in the conference as embodying the zone of proximal development (ZPD) and the conference as a language socialization experience "in which experts and novices focus on writing and how to use writing successfully in the complex institutional contexts that brought them together"(p. 52). The research addresses two primary questions: What relationship could be observed between writing conference discourse and student revisions? How did cultural and status differences among students affect instruction during the conference and student engagement with instruction as evidenced by student revisions? (p.54). The researchers analyzed the texts and transcripts of 8 students, 4 strong and 4 weak, writing in an Argumentation for Business majors course and three composition courses, one specifically for ESL students. The researchers identified two instructional topics referring to them as 'tracers" 1) Teacher requests for elaborations and clarifications 2) teacher comments and instruction on argumentative strategy, particularly the need to anticipate and refute possible counterarguments (p.59). Results showed, not surprisingly, that weaker students did not participate as much in their conferences, were not active and assertive as stronger students, and depended mostly on teacher-initiated responses. Data also revealed that teachers did not provide as much instruction to the weaker students even though the teachers often believed they were treating students equally. In addition, weaker students followed teacher suggestions closely, often placing the exact word in the revision, very much like Kate did in Herrington's study. The level of content knowledge the student possessed on the topic also allowed them to be more interactive in the conference and placed the instructor in the role of "hypothetical reader' or "academic cultural insider" rather than simply the authority (p.76), a role that Sally's instructor assumed with her. The research also indicated that students respond to the "same instructional event" differently and points to the need for further research into how students interpret and represent writing assignments and tasks in disciplinary contexts.

One of the results of the Pathey-Ferris study was that the students' level of prior knowledge not only influenced the level and quality of their interaction in the conference but their ability to write academic discourse. Ackerman's (1991) study of 40 graduate students from the

disciplines of psychology and economics analyzed how writers used topical and rhetorical knowledge to write synthesis essays. Students read 4 passages on either "supply-side economics" or "rehearsal in memory," topics general enough, in the opinion of the researcher, to transcend academic boundaries. After this they completed their synthesis essay writing for an fictionalized audience, an award review board that granted scholarships. Twenty of the students engaged in think-aloud protocols during the composing process. The researchers examined the number of elaborations (e.g. local, global) in the text, the writer's level of awareness of rhetorical features and how students used task representation. The psychology students were generally more rhetorically aware than business students and commented more about content in their essays. The evidence also indicated that all of the writers displayed a low reliance on explicit material from the essays which suggested "that the experienced writers in this study not only read for implicit themes and key ideas but were able to integrate those themes into their essays" (p.159). The fact that graduate students are excellent readers accounts for this in the opinion of the researcher. However, other results indicated that when students wrote on a familiar topic they produced more local elaborations with high knowledge writers producing 78.4% total elaborations compared with 30.6% for low-knowledge writers (p.152). Also, high-knowledge writers produced more new ideas in their essays and displayed more of what the researcher coded as "writer + text representation" which indicates that a writer wrote primarily from her own interpretation of the topic and task, and secondly from the ideas and frames in the source texts (p.145). The research also suggests that task representation may be as strong an indicator of "novelty" in writing synthesis essays as prior knowledge or the task themselves (p.168). In addition, Ackerman concludes that extensive knowledge of a topic may give the writer a "strong situational strategy." Interestingly enough, the results of the study also suggested that low knowledge writers were not at a total disadvantage and demonstrated "similar amounts of rhetorical awareness of structure and content as high-knowledge writers"(p.169) These writers used their prior knowledge, reading ability and knowledge of rhetoric to complete the essay; however, they were generally more text-dependent and relied more on source material. Additional research may want to investigate at what levels of discipline-specific knowledge do students begin to assimilate the rhetorical conventions of a content course and how may a composition course build a student's knowledge base to increase rhetorical awareness and development in the discipline. Also there is the issue of how teachers can more effectively determine students' prior knowledge of content and rhetorical ability prior to constructing a curriculum.

What is essential for effective academic writing at the postsecondary level, as the above studies indicate, is the ability for students to learn how to envision and write to an audience of knowledgeable peers and authorities. To do so requires an ability to project a persona or compose oneself in writing as Herrington's study proposes, and an ability to understand alternative viewpoints to one's own and to address these in argumentative discourse, since in many academic courses it is the primary mode of writing. Hays and Brandt's (1992) study sought to identify the socio-cognitive levels of a student's development by using William Perry's model to assess reasoning ability. Perry's model defines students' thinking based on dualism (right vs. wrong), "multiplistic thinking" (multiple and equal viewpoints) and "committed relativism."(some viewpoints are more acceptable than others). The researchers assumed that most academic writing is in the argumentative mode so it is here that they focused. They also contend that many

studies in college-level and academic writing fail to address the socio-cognitive development of students and instead focus on the individual-cognitive and the social-contextual. Their underlying assumption is that socio-cognitive structures enable students' to reason and to identify with others and their points of view, and that these structures are the result of complex interactions between an individual's cognitive structure and the context in which the individuals operate (p. 203). The study's primary focus is to examine the connection between "between writer's adaptations to their readers, their socio-cognitive development, and their overall argumentative writing performance, focusing upon their audience-centered activity as they wrote to two different readerships"(p. 204). 52 students wrote two essays on the topic of enforcing tougher drunk driving laws, first to a friendly audience and then to a hostile one. The essays were evaluated based on the numbers and kinds of response moves students' made relative to the change in the audience. Overall response activity more than doubled as students moved from a friendly to a hostile audience, but lower level writers, those rated at lower levels as dualistic or multiplistic thinkers, often did not see any difference between themselves and their readers and therefore made few response moves. When low-level students made response moves (stating concerns, giving reasons for concerns and making rebuttals) the number of inappropriate moves also increased. Many students merely spouted or listed the reasons why tougher drunk-driving laws should be enforced and made little distinction as to whether the audience was friendly or hostile, and when it was the latter, the writer often simply demonized the audience. This study raises a number of issues that need to be addressed in additional projects. Can argumentation be taught outside of a content-area? And given the fact that students are at a specific level of socio-cognitive development how can instructors develop curriculum and assignments to change the student's ability to identify with others' perspectives and address opposing viewpoints? Also it may be important to provide a theoretical framework in further inquiry that is solidly based on instructional theory, perhaps using a Vygotskian instructional model that emphasizes "scaffolding." The socio-cognitive approach centers attention on the student's developmental level and does not address the dynamic interactive and complex processes of classroom instruction. Finally, Hays and Brandt's study is somewhat limited by the open-ended nature of the topic choice and the fact that it is not contextualized within a subject or course. One could argue, for example, that teaching argumentation within a disciplinary context would make the forms of argumentation more explicit and illustrate to students how rhetorical patterns and conventions are integrated with content knowledge. Also, students unfamiliar with academic writing have to learn how to integrate personal experience with content knowledge and this is often the result of how the instructor models the use of discipline-specific discourse.

In a collaborative ethnographic study McCarthy and Fishman (1991) explored how a philosophy professor (Fishman) initiated his students into the discourse of philosophical reasoning. McCarthy observed Fishman's class and interviewed his students to understand how his approach to learning affected how he taught philosophy. Using an interpretive framework developed by Belenky et. al in *Women's Ways of Knowing*, specifically their concepts of separate knowing, connected knowing, and constructed knowledge, McCarthy sought to determine her colleague's and her own approach to teaching students how to use writing in the classroom. Fishman, influenced by Dewey's theory of learning as conflict, wanted to create a dialectic in his classroom that forced students to deal with moral/ethical conflicts and to relate their personal

experience to philosophical topics in order to construct new knowledge in their essays. Fishman formulated a pedagogy designed to relate philosophical thinking to his students "other language" and ways of knowing. He wanted his students to integrate their personal experience and knowledge with the content. However, McCarthy noticed in her interviews with Fishman's students that they were often frustrated by his assignments. Fishman's instructional approach was at odds with McCarthy, who in interpreting research data and co-authoring the project, realized that she advocated the position that teachers should teach the conventions and language of their discipline, and that as an advocate of separate knowing she viewed the presentation of written knowledge as formal and separated from the writer. In short, McCarthy saw her writing approach as based on the empirical paradigm of social science research. This study reveals the tremendous influence that an instructor has in the classroom by creating different instructional contexts, scenarios, assignments, and expectations for writing academic discourse in the classroom. However, these are often based on the instructor's own personal learning experiences. As a learner and writer, Fishman never felt that he was allowed to bring his own experience and point of view to an academic subject and decided that he would teach students differently in his classroom. In essence, his assignments were designed explicitly to initiate his students into the world of philosophical discourse and to purposely create a conflict for the student to resolve. Finally, Fishman and McCarthy suggest that it may be the epistemic differences in teacher and student positions that lead to conflict in the classroom (p. 465). However, this can be a positive learning experience, as in Fishman's class, if teachers acknowledge and address the conflict within the context of the academic course and its ways of knowing and constructing written discourse. The researchers also suggest that "learning occurs as people juxtapose conflicting ways of knowing" and question the belief that teachers or students present only one epistemic position (p. 465). What is not addressed in their study, however, is how McCarthy's approach to knowing and teaching writing would work in a philosophy class. Is the subject of philosophy more conducive to Fishman's instructional approach for teaching writing that engages the students' understanding of general principles through their personal experience and knowledge.

Berkenkotter, Huckin and Ackerman's (1988) study of a doctoral student "Nate" as he entered the disciplinary community of an interdisciplinary rhetoric program at Carnegie Mellon University is based on the expert/novice paradigm and an analysis of what the researchers call cognitive apprenticeship. Underlying the researchers' data is the assumption that each disciplinary community has its own form of academic literacies, specialized language, and register that students must assimilate in order to write the academic discourse of an insider. As indicated in the other studies, the standard way for students to acquire these literacies is through transmission from teacher to student. In this study, Nate struggles to acquire the formal register of academic discourse and to alter his expressive or oral-based form of discourse into more academic prose. He finds it very difficult to write in the empirical research mode of social scientists and struggles to "write as an observer" rather than a knower. The research data includes Nate's overuse of "I" and lack of connectives and discourse demonstratives, and evidence that his essays lacked cohesion and organization. This suggested to the researchers that Nate was grappling with ideas or "declarative knowledge" prior to understanding the "procedural knowledge" of the disciplinary genres. However, the researchers concluded that Nate's use of expressive discourse served as way for him to express and explore his ideas and as a strategy to move into the

discourse community and a more empirical mode of writing. Nate's methods echo Fishman's pedagogy of having his students engage on a personal level with philosophy through expressive discourse, except that here Nate initiates his own attempt to discover how to write academic discourse. This study is important because it focuses on an individuals' concrete situation to develop and integrate discipline-specific rhetorical and linguistic knowledge with content knowledge. The study moves beyond others in that it examines the writer's learning activity as a dynamic interaction within personal, cultural, and disciplinary contexts.

Prior (1995) socio-historic case study examines the interaction of a sociology professor, West, and her graduate student, Moira, in a seminar and the student's revision of conference paper. Prior wants to identify and analyze how the professor's word are interpreted, internalized, or rejected by the student in her text revision. He also wants to determine issues surrounding the ownership of texts and when and how the student incorporates the instructor's suggestions or resists them during their negotiation about meaning and revision. However, Prior is also interested in how the novice, the outsider, through her own developmental process and personal experiences can begin to have an affect not only on the instructor but on discipline-formation itself. Prior's theoretical framework is based on Bakhtin's socio-historic theory of language, and the dialogical interaction of individuals in concrete situations and activities, especially while they negotiate words and meanings. Herrington (1992) at the end of her study referred to Bakhtin's dialogical methodolgy and his notion of internally persuasive discourse as a another way to understand the enculturation process of students like Kate and Sally. It is included as a postscript, but for Prior Bakhtin's theory is fundamental to this study and to his dissertation (1992), which studied students' writing and revising in four graduate seminars during a multi-year research project. The results of his dissertation research are echoed in this study. Following Bakhtin, Prior argues that discourse communities are not static but dynamic and ever-changing entities that are evolving through the situated and concrete activities of individuals, such as the interaction of a graduate student and her professor when they respond to the student's text. Prior's studies are unique because he studies the interaction of student and teacher as it unfolds against the backdrop of institutional, disciplinary, and historical contexts. Indeed, the student-teacher interaction is embedded in multiple contexts of meaning, including the nature of the graduate seminar, Moira's personal interest in the topic of adolescent psycho social development, Professor's West prolific publishing record, Moira's need for a mentor, etc. Prior identifies and analyzes the multiple institutional roles of the instructor as mentor, teacher, advisor, principal investigator, all of which are impacting on the disciplinary socialization process of Moira and also the affecting the mentor as well. By resisting the professor's words at times and making her own revision, Moira is developing her own persona relative to defining her place in this discourse community. However, when she resists the professor's words and ideas, but eventually includes them in her text, Prior sees this as an indication that the words have an "authoritative" appeal that enables the student to further her disciplinary enculturation. It is critical then to determine when ideas or concepts are interpreted by a student as authoritative or not. In developing her own ideas and making contributions to the paper, Moira, according to Prior, is impacting her chosen field of study, and continuing the process of disciplinary formation.

Each of these studies points to the importance of the role of the instructor in creating learning environments that foster a student's initiation and socialization into a discourse

community. The instructors's ability to create roles for students to learn how to write and integrate personal knowledge and experience with academic content is also very important in this process. Clearly, how the instructor models and defines reasoning and what constitutes good writing in the content course is very important. However, more studies must be done, however, to examine the interaction between the cognitive, cultural and social processes by which one learns to write in many fields, including the sciences, and other non-academic discourses. The area for qualitative research that may be rich would be to take the focus away from students and instead concentrate on how instructors understand and interpret the nature of writing in their field. By learning more about how writers write differently in various communities, the instructional process in composition and academic courses can only be enriched. Also, there must be more research to learn how students during the revision process understand what it means to make global revisions and for researchers to discover how students represent this process to themselves. Finally, it may be worthwhile to continue to look at the revision process in many disciplines to identify similar or different instructional approaches for teaching writing in and across the disciplines.

References

Ackerman, J. M. (1991). Reading, writing and knowing: The role of disciplinary knowledge in comprehension and composing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 25, 137-173.

Beason, L. (1993). Feedback and revision in writing across the curriculum classes. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 27, 395-422.

Berkenkotter, C. & Huckin, T. N. (1995). Conventions, conversations and the writer: An apprenticeship tale of a doctoral student. In *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication.* (pp.117-144). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Originally published with Ackerman, J. in 1988 in *Research in the Teaching of English*, 22(1), 9-44.

Doheny-Farina, S. (1989). A case study of one adult writing in academic and nonacademic discourse communities. In C. Matalene (Ed.), *Worlds of Writing* (pp 17-42). New York: Random House.

Hays, J. & Brandt, K. (1992). Socio-cognitive development and students' performance on audience-centered argumentative writing. In M. Secor & D. Charney (Eds.), *Constructing Rhetorical Education* (pp. 202-229). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Herrington, A. (1985). Writing in academic settings: A study of the contexts for writing in two chemical engineering courses. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 19. 331-359.

Herrington, A. (1992). Composing one's self in a discipline: Students' and teachers' negotiations. In M. Secor & D. Charney (Eds.), *Constructing Rhetorical Education* (pp. 91-115). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

McCarthy, L. P. (1987). A stranger in strange lands: a college student writing across the curriculum. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 21, 233-65.

McCarthy, L.P. & Walvoord, B. (1990). *Thinking and writing in college: A naturalistic study of students in four disciplines.* Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

McCarthy, L. P. & Fishman, S. M. (1991). Boundary conversations: Conflicting ways of knowing in philosophy and interdisciplinary research. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 25 419-368.

Patthey-Chavez, C.G. & Ferris, D. R. (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multi-voiced texts in college composition. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31, 51-90.

Prior, P. (1992). Contextualizing writing and response in graduate seminars: A sociohistoric perspective on academic literacies. (Volumes I and II) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53, 2281-A. (University Microfilms No. 92-36, 970).

Prior, P. (1995). Tracing authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, a case study of response, revision, and disciplinary enculturation. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 29, 288-325.